UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.371
9 July 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 371st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 5 July 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. AFONSO (Mozambique)

CONTENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 44/120 (continued)

(a) WORK ON THE SUBSTANTIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 6, 7, 8, 9 AND 10 OF RESOLUTION 44/120

(b) REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 44/120

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 44/120 (continued) (A/AC.159/L.60, L.61, L.74, and L.98)

(a) WORK ON THE SUBSTANTIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 6, 7, 8, 9 AND 10 OF RESOLUTION 44/120

(b) REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 44/120

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Ad Hoc Committee had reached agreement at the previous meeting on the first seven items of the draft framework of the provisional agenda for the Conference on the Indian Ocean. The conclusions reached at that meeting would be submitted to the Committee at a later stage. He now invited the Committee to consider items 8 to 12 of the draft framework of the provisional agenda, as contained in the annex to document A/AC.159/L.60.

2. Mr. YOSHIDA (Secretary of the Committee) said that the handwritten amendment of the word "Recommendations" to "Report" at the beginning of item 8 was an error and that "Recommendations" was the correct word.

3. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman), supported by the CHAIRMAN and by Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen), said that he would prefer the word "Report".

4. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that he too preferred the word "Report" because the Ad Hoc Committee would in due course have to submit a report. That word was therefore more appropriate than "Recommendations".

5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to replace the word "Recommendations" in item 8 with the word "Report".

6. It was so decided.

7. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said that it would be even clearer if the item were reworded to read "Report of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee".

8. The CHAIRMAN said that the Ad Hoc Committee had a specific mandate which included undertaking the preparatory work for the Conference and that the Conference on the Indian Ocean must be able to judge how that mandate had been fulfilled. It would therefore be preferable to refer to the report of the Committee, while indicating that it would be presented by the Chairman.

9. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said he was unclear as to whether it had in fact been decided that the Ad Hoc Committee would be the preparatory committee for the Conference.

10. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) said that, in his view, the Ad Hoc Committee was the preparatory committee for the Conference. He agreed with the representative of Sri Lanka that the report in question would not be a personal report by the Chairman but rather a report by the Ad Hoc Committee as a whole.

11. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) agreed with the previous speaker and drew attention to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 34/80 B. The Ad Hoc Committee would adopt a report for submission to the Conference, but that report would be presented by the Chairman.

12. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia), supported by the CHAIRMAN, said that the Ad Hoc Committee was in fact the preparatory committee for the Conference but that its report should also contain recommendations. Turning to item 9, she said that its wording failed to make it clear whether the review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area would take place in a general debate or whether specific bodies would be established for it.

13. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that the purpose of the Conference was more than simply to review the situation in the Indian Ocean area. He therefore suggested that item 9 should be reworded to read "Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area since the adoption of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

14. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the main purpose was to have a general debate, but one that focused specifically on the Declaration.

15. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said that the situation in the Indian Ocean area had changed over the past six to seven years. He therefore agreed that item 9 should refer either to a "general debate" or to a "review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area since the adoption of the 1971 Declaration," as suggested by the representative of Oman.

16. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said it was his understanding that the purpose of agenda items 9 and 10 was to guide a general debate. He drew attention to paragraph 2 of the annex to document A/AC.159/L.74 and said that the Conference should have before it recommendations from appropriate subsidiary bodies. Agenda items 9 and 10 should therefore deal with the general debate, but consideration must also be given to which appropriate bodies should be established.

17. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said that there should first be a general debate to hear statements, and then the appropriate bodies should be established. A general debate was perfectly in order even if it did have a specific focus.

18. Mr. PLATIS (Greece), referring to rule 44 of the draft provisional rules of procedure of the Conference (A/AC.159/L.61), said that agenda items 9 and 10 should be considered by either one or two main committees, which would report and, if appropriate, make recommendations to the President of the Conference.

READEX FICHE

19. Mr. JAIN (India) suggested that a new item 9, entitled "General debate", should be included in the provisional agenda. As the representative of Sri Lanka had suggested, the general debate could be held in the plenary meeting and existing items 9 and 10 could be considered in the main committees.

20. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation could accept the proposed inclusion of a new agenda item 9 entitled "General debate". The Ad Hoc Committee could assume that it was considering the establishment of two main committees for the consideration of current items 9 and 10. The two committees in question could submit reports to the Conference.

21. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) agreed that a new item 9 entitled "General debate" should be included in the agenda. Main committees and other subsidiary bodies should be established for the purpose of considering existing items 9, 10 and 11. A committee of the whole should also be set up.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to include a new item 9 entitled "General debate" in the provisional agenda.

23. It was so decided.

24. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said that he wished to make a formal proposal that, after the new item 9 just adopted, the provisional agenda should read:

"10. Establishment of main committees with a view to exchanging views or policies on:

(a) Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area;

(b) Consideration of principal elements of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace as contained in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in resolution 2832 (XXVI) and as considered at the meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of July 1979 as well as at the subsequent meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean taking into account all its relevant work;

(c) Modalities and Programme of Action for finalizing an international agreement and adoption of other practical measures for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

11. Adoption of the report of the Conference."

25. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) said that if the wording of former item 9 was reproduced in truncated form in proposed item 10 (a), the decisive point at issue would be lost.

26. Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe) said that the Conference must review the situation in the Indian Ocean area in the manner described in former item 9.

27. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said that her delegation might be able to accept the proposal by the representative of Greece. She wished to stress that one of the fundamental issues that must be dealt with at the Conference was that of the presence of foreign military Powers in the region. That issue was covered by new item 10 (b) proposed by Greece, which referred to the 1971 Declaration. Another relevant element was the security situation in the region as it applied to the States of the region.

28. Mr. JAIN (India), referring to the proposal put forward by Greece, said that organizational matters such as the establishment of main committees should be dealt with under the item entitled "Organization of work", and that substantive matters should be dealt with separately, as in the annex to document A/AC.159/L.60. Where former item 9 was concerned, it must be emphasized that a specific focus for discussion was required. That focus must be within the context of the 1971 Declaration and the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

29. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia), supported by Mr. HADI (Indonesia) and Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan), suggested that former item 9 should simply be deleted.

30. Mr. SHA Zukang (China) said that his delegation's position, as set forth in document A/AC.159/1985/CRP.1, was that the wording of former item 9 was basically sound, since it clearly maintained that the political and military situation in the area of the Indian Ocean ought to be a major question for deliberation at the Conference. The substantive content of the item should not be further revised or weakened. China could accept a slight modification of the text of former item 9, provided that the thrust of the item was retained. For example, the text could also refer to the security situation as mentioned by Australia.

31. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that, since the wording of former item 9 had been taken from the relevant General Assembly resolutions, he doubted whether the Committee had the authority to change it. However, that would not prevent the Conference from deciding that the item might no longer be relevant.

32. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said that, according to its mandate, the Committee must base its deliberations on the relevant General Assembly resolutions. However, since existing item 10 mentioned the 1971 Declaration, it encompassed the concerns expressed in former item 9. He therefore reiterated his earlier proposal to delete repetitious language.

33. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) suggested that, in view of the overlap between former item 9 and existing item 10 and the Committee's decision to include a general debate as an item on the agenda, former item 9 should simply be deleted. In its report to the Conference, the Committee could propose the establishment of a committee to consider the matters raised in former item 9. A committee could also be set up to formulate proposals with regard to existing item 11.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee appeared to be facing only one major stumbling block, namely, the wording of former item 9. While he welcomed the positive aspects of the proposal by the representative of Greece, he questioned

(The Chairman)

whether a reference should be made to the establishment of committees, especially since there was an item entitled "Organization of work".

35. Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe) said that, in the light of the clarification given by the representative of Greece, he would have no difficulty in accepting that country's proposal.

36. Mr. HADI (Indonesia), referring to former item 9, suggested that the first line should be retained but the second line and most of the third line deleted, so that the item read "Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area with particular reference to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". Since the content of former item 9 was subsumed in existing item 10, he also felt that the proposal by the representative of Australia was useful.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that if the proposal by the representative of Indonesia was acceptable to the Committee, he saw no difficulty in merging former item 9 and existing item 10.

38. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) suggested that, since the Committee had agreed to the inclusion of a new item 9, former item 9 should be deleted. Existing items 10 and 11 would be retained, with item 10 mentioning other relevant General Assembly resolutions. Lastly, in its report to the Conference, the Committee should propose the creation of two main committees to consider the issues raised in items 10 and 11.

39. Mr. PLATIS (Greece), supported by Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman), agreed to the proposal.

40. Mr. JAIN (India) said that, in its search for an appropriate formula, the Committee might be losing sight of the main objective of the Conference, which was to implement the 1971 Declaration. Without a reference to the foreign military presence in the region, the proposed agenda would be devoid of substance. His delegation therefore had difficulty in accepting the proposal to delete such a reference.

41. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) supported the proposals by the representatives of Greece and Sri Lanka.

42. Mr. CURE (Mauritius) said he had no objection to the Indonesian and Sri Lankan proposals. He suggested that the first line of former item 9 should be redrafted to read "Review and reassessment of the situation in the Indian Ocean area with particular reference to". The remainder of that item would be deleted and the text would then continue with the first line of existing item 10.

43. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) appealed to the representative of India to reconsider his objection to the proposals before the Committee, so as not to stand in the way of a consensus.

44. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) drew attention to the Sri Lankan proposal. It would be difficult for his Government to agree to the retention of former item 9 in its entirety.

45. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) suggested that the discussion should be postponed to a later meeting.

46. The CHAIRMAN urged delegations to give special consideration to the Sri Lankan proposal, which had brought the Committee closer to a consensus.

47. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that, in view of the difficulties raised by the representative of India, the members of the Committee must hold an informal exchange of views.

48. The CHAIRMAN appealed for co-operation on the part of all delegations.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.372
10 July 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 372nd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 6 July 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. PERERA (Sri Lanka)

CONTENTS

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/120 (continued)

(a) Work on the substantive and organizational issues related to the Conference on the Indian Ocean in accordance with paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 44/120

(b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session on the implementation of resolution 44/120.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 44/120 (continued) (A/AC.159/L.60, L.61, L.74 and L.98; A/AC.159/1985/CRP.1 and CRP.2)

(a) WORK ON THE SUBSTANTIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 6, 7, 8, 9 AND 10 OF RESOLUTION 44/120

(b) REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 44/120

1. The CHAIRMAN said that there seemed to be general agreement on items 1 to 7 of the draft framework of the provisional agenda for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean (A/AC.159/L.60). The order of the agenda items would be determined on the basis of current practice. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to insert two items entitled "Moment of prayer and meditation" and "Statement by the Secretary-General" after agenda item 7.

2. It was so decided.

3. Ms. WICKES (Australia) wondered whether it was necessary to include an item on the confirmation of the nomination of the secretary-general of the Conference.

4. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that the representative of Australia had raised an important point. He therefore proposed that an item entitled "Confirmation of the nomination of the secretary-general of the Conference" should be included in the provisional agenda.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the Sri Lankan nomination of the proposal. The order in which the new item would appear in the provisional agenda would be determined at a later date.

6. It was so decided.

7. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that at the previous meeting his delegation had proposed that agenda item 9 should be deleted, since that question would be discussed in the general debate, and that two Main Committees should be established to consider items 10 and 11. The representative of India, however, had stated that his delegation had serious difficulties regarding the deletion of agenda item 9. The representative of Greece, on the other hand, had said that his delegation could not accept the current wording of that item. Accordingly, his delegation would not insist on its proposal, which should perhaps be the subject of consultations.

8. Mr. NAIMI ARFA (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation would also have difficulty with the deletion of agenda item 9 and felt that consultations should be held to agree on a new wording for that item.

9. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) proposed that, in order to reconcile the divergent views, agenda item 9 should be amended to read "Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area with reference to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

10. Mr. PLATIS (Greece) said that he fully supported the proposal by the representative of Indonesia. Nevertheless, the Committee would have to decide whether the question of the establishment of Main Committees would be discussed under agenda item 7 and what items they would deal with.

11. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) said that, if his proposal was adopted, it would be logical to set up three working groups to deal with agenda items 9, 10 and 11.

12. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation could support the retention of paragraph 9 if it was possible to find suitable language accommodating all concerns.

13. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) and Mr. ZIMBA (Mozambique) said that they supported the proposal made by the representative of Indonesia.

14. Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the proposal by Indonesia might solve the problem that had arisen with regard to agenda item 9. Nevertheless, her delegation felt that the phrase "with reference to" in the wording proposed by Indonesia should be replaced by the phrase "in the context of achieving".

The meeting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.25 p.m.

15. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) suggested that, in the light of the informal discussions during the suspension, agenda item 9 might be reworded to read "Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area, in the context of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

16. Mr. JAIN (India) said that a final decision on the wording of agenda item 9 should be deferred until a later stage in order to afford delegations the time they needed to consult with their Governments.

17. Mr. SHA Zukang (China) stated that his delegation's position on item 9 remained as stated in document A/AC.159/1985/CRP.1, but that, in the interests of expediting the Ad Hoc Committee's work, it could accept the wording suggested by the representative of Indonesia, provided that all the other delegations did so also.

18. Mr. NAIMI ARFA (Islamic Republic of Iran) stated that his delegation, too, needed more time before taking a position on the wording suggested by the representative of Indonesia.

19. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had no objection to the proposed new wording of agenda item 9, which would take cognizance of the major changes that had occurred in the world. A final decision could be taken at a later stage in accordance with the wishes of several delegations.

20. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that his Government's position on the issues before the Committee was clearly stated in document A/AC.159/L.103. Since many delegations needed to obtain instructions from their Governments, he said that it would be useful if document A/AC.159/L.60 could be revised to reflect the agreement achieved so far.

21. Mr. RICHTER (German Democratic Republic) noted with satisfaction that there was now hope that a consensus on item 9 would emerge on the basis of the useful proposals made.

22. Mr. KATSIGAZI (Uganda) said that the changes which had taken place in the world situation since 1971 had not affected the objectives of the Declaration of 1971. He expressed satisfaction at the consensus which seemed to be emerging with regard to the agenda.

23. Mr. ALATIS (Greece) asked whether the establishment of Main Committees would be dealt with under "Organization of Work", "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference", or some other item.

24. Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that provided that the proposed new wording of agenda item 9 was taken to include, inter alia, the continued dangers posed by the military presence of the great Powers and also other foreign military presence, her country could accept the change. With regard to the very pertinent question from the representative of Greece, she suggested that the question of establishment of Main Committees could be covered in the rules of procedure.

25. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that, while agreeing in principle with the rewording of agenda item 9, his delegation had to seek instructions from its Government before it could give its final approval to the proposed change.

26. Mr. AL-ALFI (Yemen) stated that, while his delegation would have preferred the original wording of item 9, it was prepared to go along with the new one in a spirit of compromise. However, he wished to receive clarification of certain phrases in the original title of the item. Firstly, since item 9 already referred to "the great Powers", he wondered what was meant by "other foreign military presence". Secondly, he asked whether the phrase "whenever it is contrary to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", referred to "other foreign military presence" or to "the military presence of the great Powers". Those who insisted on retaining the original wording of item 9 might change their minds after considering those points. He proposed that a final decision on the matter should be taken early the following week.

27. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) concurred with the representative of Yemen on the time-frame for a final decision on item 9. With regard to the concerns expressed by the representative of Greece, he proposed that the Ad Hoc Committee might make a recommendation to the Conference to establish three Main Committees under "Organization of Work" or under some other appropriate item of the agenda.

28. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) supported the view that the question of setting up working groups to deal with agenda itmes 9, 10 and 11 should be dealt with in the rules of procedure.

29. Mr. JAIN (India) emphasized that it would be useful to issue a revised document reflecting the Committee's decisions so far on the draft framework of the provisional agenda so that each delegation would have an identical point of reference. Once the provisional agenda was finally approved, the document would become a specific recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference.

30. Mr. ALATIS (Greece), supported by Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka), said that since Rule 44 of the rules of procedure dealt with the establishment of Main Committees and working groups, it was not necessary to deal with that question in the agenda. However, a reference to the matter could be included in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would produce an informal paper reflecting the results of the discussion so far in order to assist delegations in consulting with their Governments with a view to taking a decision on the issues still pending.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.373
11 July 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 373rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 6 July 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. PERERA (Sri Lanka)

CONTENTS

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/120 (continued)

(a) Work on the substantive and organizational issues related to the Conference on the Indian Ocean in accordance with paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 44/120

(b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session on the implementation of resolution 44/120

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 44/120 (continued)

(a) WORK ON THE SUBSTANTIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 6, 7, 8, 9 AND 10 OF RESOLUTION 44/120 (A/AC.159/L.61)

(b) REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 44/120

Draft framework of the provisional agenda for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft framework of the provisional agenda for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean set forth in an informal paper, which had just been distributed to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee. The draft framework, which reflected the views expressed by delegations in the Committee, read:

"DRAFT FRAMEWORK OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

1. Opening of the Conference.

2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation.

3. Statement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations or his representative.

4. Confirmation of the Secretary-General of the Conference.

5. Election of the President.

6. Adoption of the rules of procedure.

7. Election of other officers.

8. Credentials of the representatives to the Conference:

   (i) Appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee;

   (ii) Report of the Credentials Committee.

9. Adoption of the agenda.

10. Organization of work.

(The Chairman)

11. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in its capacity as Preparatory Committee for the Conference.

12. General debate.

13. [Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area with particular reference to the continued dangers posed by the military presence of the great Powers, and also other foreign military presence, whenever it is contrary to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.]

[Review of the situation in the Indian Ocean area in the context of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.]

14. Consideration of principal elements of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace as contained in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in Resolution 2832 (XXVI) and as considered at the meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of July 1979 as well as at the subsequent meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean taking into account all its relevant work.

15. Modalities and programme of action for finalizing an international agreement and adoption of other practical measures for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

16. Adoption of the report of the Conference."

2. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) suggested that the item entitled "Adoption of the agenda" should immediately follow the item entitled "Confirmation of the Secretary-General of the Conference". It would also be preferable for the item entitled "Credentials of the representatives to the Conference" to precede the item entitled "Election of other officers".

3. Mr. JAIN (India) suggested that the title of the document should read: "Draft provisional agenda for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean". Once the Committee had adopted the draft provisional agenda, the word "draft" would automatically be dropped from the title. He also wished to suggest that the words "or his representative" should be deleted from agenda item 3. Agenda item 4 was not necessary. Where the order of the agenda items was concerned, he believed that the item entitled "Adoption of the agenda" should be placed as high as possible on the agenda. The item entitled "Minute of silent prayer or meditation" should be placed after the item entitled "Election of the President". Where agenda item 13 was concerned, his delegation expected to be able to indicate its position on the sentences in square brackets at the following meeting.

4. Mr. GORAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the word "provisional" was not needed in the title of the document before the Committee. He agreed with Australia that the item entitled "Adoption of the agenda" should come immediately after item 4. With

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

regard to the item entitled "Credentials of the representatives to the Conference", he assumed that a week or more would elapse before the members of the Credentials Committee were ready to submit their reports.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take account of the comments made by the representatives of Australia, India and Poland in deciding what the order of the agenda items should be.

6. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) suggested that since the Committee was near to a consensus on his delegation's suggestion that item 1 should read "Opening of the Conference by a representative of Sri Lanka", the members of the Committee might wish to adopt a decision on the matter at the following meeting.

Draft provisional rules of procedure of the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean (A/AC.159/L.61)

I. Representation and credentials (rules 1-5)

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider section I of the draft provisional rules of procedure in the light of the views expressed in his informal paper on the procedural aspects of the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo (A/AC.159/L.89).

8. Mr. JAIN (India) recalled that document A/AC.159/1985/CRP.2 contained a written submission from his Government, the beginning of which read:

> "Rules 3, 4 and 5 - Add a new paragraph 4 (bis):
>
> 'If an objection is raised against the representation of a delegation, such objection shall be considered by the Credentials Committee forthwith. The report thereon shall be submitted to the Conference without delay.'"

9. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said that since it was the role of the Credentials Committee to judge credentials, she would be interested to hear the Legal Counsel's views on the matter.

10. Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) asked why it was necessary, in rule 1, to specify a limit of no more than five other accredited representatives.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that rule 1 was based on rule 25 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

12. Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that such a limit need not apply to a conference held outside the framework of the General Assembly. She therefore suggested that the number be left open.

13. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that the Ad Hoc Committee should abide as closely as possible by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly in order to

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

avoid complications and the need to rewrite the rules. Perhaps it would suffice to say that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly should apply.

14. Mr. JAIN (India) said that he agreed with the representative of Tanzania. Normally, the Committee should abide by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, but in the rule under consideration the number five was an arbitrary limit that served no purpose. It was up to delegations themselves to decide how many representatives and advisers they wished to appoint. He therefore proposed that the reference to five should be deleted.

15. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) agreed with the representative of Sri Lanka. The closer the Ad Hoc Committee adhered to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the easier it would be to obtain a consensus.

16. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that the Ad Hoc Committee should avoid making any changes, so as not to delay progress in areas that needed decisions.

17. Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in the light of the statement by the representative of Sri Lanka, she was prepared to proceed without making any changes.

18. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said she agreed with the representative of Sri Lanka but wished to point out that the rules of procedure drawn up by the Ad Hoc Committee would be different from those of the General Assembly. At some point, the Ad Hoc Committee would have to establish just who the participants would be.

19. Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe) agreed that established rules of procedure should be followed closely, but also felt that some participants might want larger delegations. The Conference was a special one and was not comparable to the General Assembly. He therefore supported the idea of not specifying a limit of five.

20. Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said he was prepared to go along with that proposal if it was the wish of the Committee.

21. Mr. GORAJEWSKI (Poland) drew attention to rule 25 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and suggested that the rule under discussion should specify not more than five representatives but omit the words "by a head of delegation".

22. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) said that he could be flexible, but that he would prefer to omit any reference to a specific number.

23. Mr. JAIN (India) expressed surprise that there was no reference to heads of delegations in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. However, he still felt that it would be very useful to retain the reference to heads of delegation in the rule under discussion. If a delegation did not choose to designate a head, that presented no problem.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Ad Hoc Committee wished to delete the words "not more than five".

25. It was so decided.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no comment on rule 2, he would proceed to rule 3.

27. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said that before proceeding, she wished to point out that there was no need to reach a formal agreement on each rule.

28. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the formal adoption of each rule would expedite the Committee's work. Most of the rules were based on those of the General Assembly and should create no difficulty. Those on which no agreement could be reached could be left until later.

29. Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) said it would be useful to identify those rules on which agreement had or had not been reached, but that she would have to consult her Government before formally adopting any rules which she might have accepted provisionally.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, for the time being, the Committee should simply identify areas of agreement and disagreement.

31. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that he too would have to consult his Government before formally adopting any rules. He therefore proposed that the Committee first identify areas of disagreement.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.